

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating claim 64 as allowable in the Office Action dated September 29, 2003 (Office Action at 7).

I. Status of the Claims

By the present amendment, originally presented claims 1-87 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 88-181 have been added. Support for the present amendment may be found in the specification as originally filed, including the original claims. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

New claims 152-169 incorporate the subject matter of original claim 64, indicated as allowable in the Office Action. These new claims, with the corresponding original claims indicated as allowable, are shown in the following table.

New Claims	Support
152	Original Claim 64
153-169	Original Claims 55-63 and 65-73

Additionally, new claims 88-151 and 170-181 have been added. As recited in new independent claims 88-91, the rate of irradiation not constant and comprises a rate of between 0.1kGy/hr to 3.0kGy/hr for at least a portion of the period of irradiation and a rate of at least 6.0kGy/hr for at least another portion of the period of irradiation. Support for this limitation may be found in the specification as originally filed, for instance, paragraphs 69 through 75. The undersigned notes that this limitation is the same as that recited in

independent claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,695, which issued from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/197,248.

II. Response to the Grounds of Rejection

In the outstanding Office Action, the Office made the following grounds of rejection:

- A) Claims 1-5, 17-27, 30, 31, 36-42, 50-52, 54-63, 66-75, 86 and 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,730,933 to Peterson (“Peterson”).
- B) Claims 1, 12-16, 49, 53, 74, and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,989,498 to Odland;
- C) Claims 54, 55, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,981,163 to Horowitz et al. (“Horowitz et al.”);
- D) Claims 1, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,727,027 to Wieshehahn et al.;
- E) Claims 6, 7, 28, 29, 32, 35, and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Horowitz et al. in view Peterson;
- F) Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Peterson in view of in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,171,549 to Kent (“Kent”); and
- G) Claims 74-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Horowitz in view of in view of Kent.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and respectfully submit that the rejections are moot for at least the following reason. Originally presented claims 1-87, as discussed above, have been cancelled. New claims 152-169 have been added, which encompass the subject matter indicated as allowable by the Examiner, i.e., original claim 64. Since these claims recite subject matter indicated as allowable in the Office Action, the prior art of record fails to teach or to suggest the invention as recited in new claims 152-169 for at least the reasons noted by the Examiner in the Office Action with respect to original claim 64 (Office Action at 7). Therefore, these grounds of rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding new claims 88-151 and 170-181, the undersigned respectfully submits that the prior art of record fails to teach or to suggest methods for sterilizing biological materials, as presently claimed, wherein the rate of irradiation is not constant and comprises a rate of between 0.1kGy/hr to 3.0kGy/hr for at least a portion of the period of irradiation and a rate of at least 6.0kGy/hr for at least another portion of the period of irradiation. Therefore, for at least this reason, new claims 88-151 and 170-181 are allowable over the prior art of record.

As indicated above, this limitation, *viz.*, the rate of irradiation is not constant and comprises a rate of between 0.1kGy/hr to 3.0kGy/hr for at least a portion of the period of irradiation and a rate of at least 6.0kGy/hr for at least another portion of the period of irradiation, is the same as that recited in independent claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,682,695 which issued from U.S. Patent Application No. 10/197,248. As noted by the Examiner in that related application, the prior art fails to teach or to suggest methods for sterilizing

Serial No. 09/960,700
Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2003

Docket No. CI-0010

biological materials wherein the dose rate is increased during the course of irradiation (see U.S. Patent Application No. 10/197,248, Office Action dated July 7, 2003). Therefore, new claims 88-151 and 170-181 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned agent, Timothy M. Speer, at the telephone number listed below. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Donald R. McPhail
Registration No. 35,811
Timothy M. Speer
Registration No. 47,355

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701

DRM\TMS\BLY:mrh

Date: March 1, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610